



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CRLA No.1118 of 2024

Madan Pradhan

...

Appellant

Mr. N. Panda, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha

...

Respondent

Mr. A.K. Apat, Addl. PP

Mr. A.S. Paul, Advocate (informant)

CORAM:
JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

ORDER(ORAL)
12.03.2025

Order No.
04.

I.A. No. 2546 of 2024

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. The present Interlocutory Application U/S.5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 has been filed by the appellant to condone the delay of 159 days in preferring the appeal.
3. Heard Mr. Niranjana Panda, learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner, Mr. A.K.Apat, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor and Mr. Amlan Shakti Paul, learned counsel, who enters appearance for the informant in Court today by filing Vakalatnama in the matter and perused the record. The Vakalatnama be kept on record.
4. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on going through the averments taken in



the I.A., since there is a delay of 159 days which has been properly explained by the appellant, this Court notwithstanding to the objections raised by the respondents considers it in the interest of justice to condone the delay. Accordingly, the delay of 159 days in preferring the appeal is, hereby, condoned.

5. The I.A. is accordingly, disposed of.

CRLA No.1118 of 2024

6. This is an appeal by the appellant for commission of offence punishable U/Ss.376(2)(n)/376(3) r/w. Section 6 of the POCSO Act.

7. Heard Mr. Niranjan Panda, learned counsel for the appellant, Mr. A.K. Apat, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor and Mr. A.S. Paul, learned counsel appearing for the informant in the matter and perused the record.

8. Admit. Call for the soft/digitized copy of the LCR/TCR by the next date.

9. Indicating the name of Mr. Amlan Shakti Paul, as a counsel for informant in the cause list as well as brief, list this matter on 8th April, 2025.

I.A. Nos.2544 & 2545 of 2024

10. These aforesaid two IAs would be taken up after receipt of the soft copy of the LCR/TCR.

11. Since the appellant-petitioner has been convicted and sentenced to undergo RI for 20 years,



the State Counsel is at liberty to file written objection to the bail application of the petitioner in terms of the law laid down by the Apex Court in ***Atul Tripathi vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Others; (2014) 9 SCC 177.***

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

S.Sasmal